

honor and celebrate Dick's legacy by rededicating ourselves to the ideals and the values that he championed. My thoughts and prayers are with the Iglehart family this evening as the memorial service is taking place at this very moment.

He will always hold a special place in my heart and in the heart of many.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much. We would like to say to the family, we love you, Dick. We will see you around and give a hug to our friends in heaven, and we will keep the torch burning.

Christine Pelosi said Dick taught us to put a human face on the criminal justice system for terrified and traumatized victims and witnesses, while understanding that today's defendants could well be yesterday's or tomorrow's victims. Dick had the legal acumen, rock-solid integrity, and sense of humor that helped us address those sad realities, and to manage the pressure to succeed as prosecutors and grow as legal professionals. But Dick was more than just a boss "he was a great big bear of a man who always stuck up for us young prosecutors, particularly the women, when judges of opponents tried to rough us up. Having his confidence in us made us all the more able to successfully prosecute the tough cases."

Attorney Michael Weiss said: "He asked me if I had ever thought about being a prosecutor. I told him that I had briefly entertained the idea. He told me that he had spent nearly his entire career in law as a prosecutor and that he couldn't remember a day when he didn't look forward to going to work." "My days working for Dick were some of my best. And to this day, his words continued to inspire me: to find a quality in my work that makes it something I look forward to, every day."

HONORING BOB STUMP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time this evening to rise and say a few words about our late colleague, the beloved chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services and before that the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. A few words might be the operative thing to say here this evening about Bob Stump because Bob Stump did not talk very often on the floor. In fact, in these 5 minutes I think I will say more words than I ever remember Bob Stump saying other than on a bill which he presented to the floor to the Congress of the United States.

He may have been a man of few words, but he was not a man of little action; and he was not a man of little commitment. Many others have spoken either here on the floor or at the ceremony where his portrait was unveiled

or his funeral service just a few days ago in Phoenix about many aspects of his life.

I would like to talk for a moment about a couple of the personal things that I remember about Bob Stump. I knew him before he came to the Congress and long before I came to the Congress when he was the president of the Arizona State Senate. I did not serve with him in the Senate. I came to the Senate at the time that he left there to come to the United States Congress. But he served in that Senate with Sandra Day O'Connor who later became a Justice of the United States Supreme Court. They were on opposite sides. He was president of the Senate. She was the minority leader in the Arizona State Senate at that time. But they always had a great deal of respect for each other, and I think it was this respect that characterizes the way that everybody felt about Bob Stump through the years.

He came to the Congress in 1976 and served here for 26 years. I think in the entire time that Bob Stump served in the Congress he had one press conference, and that was the press conference where he announced that he was switching from a Democrat to a Republican. When Bob moved from a seat on that side of the aisle to a seat on this side of the aisle, he really did not change at all. He was the same person that he had always been, a fiscal conservative, a hard-nosed individual who believed strongly in national defense and somebody who cared passionately about veterans. He, himself, was a veteran and he knew the sacrifices that veterans had made and he knew the commitment that this country had made to providing for health care for our veterans. And Bob Stump continued in his service here in the House of Representatives doing it with little fanfare.

Bob Stump came to the office every morning at about 5 a.m., and he would open all the mail. He had his desk in his office like most of us had, but he also had a desk in the back room, and it was there that he spent most of the time, opening the mail, working with his staff.

He did not have a lot of staff people, about half of the number most of us had. And yet he took care of his constituents. He always listened to them, always met with them, always found time to be available for them. And on weekends he faithfully went home to the district, and he faithfully went to his farm and worked the cotton crop on the farm. He looked after his constituents. They always felt that they could be in touch with Bob Stump. He never lost touch with his constituents.

He was an unassuming person who asked for very little recognition or glory. He called everything exactly as he saw it. He never minced any words. When you asked Bob Stump about something, you knew exactly where he stood. But I think it is his commitment to veterans and a commitment to

a strong national defense reflected in the work he did on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and later as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services that he will always be remembered for.

He may not get his name etched in stone and, indeed, future generations of veterans and those who served in the armed services may never know his name, but they will be indebted to him. They will be indebted to him for the health care system we have for veterans and the quality of health care we provide in the veterans hospitals all over this country. So there will be many who will never have known his name, but they will be in great debt to him as those of us in the House of Representatives are in debt to him for his unfailingly hard work, his unassuming stance, his willingness to call it like it was, and his dedication and his commitment to this institution.

We will miss Bob Stump, but we are grateful for the time that we had with him, and we are grateful for his service to his country and to the veterans of this Nation.

LET THE TRUTH BE KNOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I always have risen to the floor at this time to try to speak on the unfinished business of this House. Just for a quick moment I am going to speak at length about the first issue at another time, but I do want to join with my colleagues that are raising the concern about whether or not evidence substantiated representations that were made by the President of the United States on the determination or the actuality of weapons of mass destruction. I hope to be able to debate that question at a later time and to reiterate my call for an independent commission and as well a special prosecutor.

I leave just a singular sentence, and that is that the truth should be known and the truth should be known not only by this body and the other body, but the truth should be known by the American people.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise, however, to recount for my colleagues the final results of the resolution of inquiry before the House Committee on the Judiciary today. And after a vigorous debate, I am sad to say that the House Committee on the Judiciary reported unfavorably this resolution of inquiry. It is a simple inquiry and it is broader than what you may have heard over the weeks and days on the Texas incident regarding the redistricting plan that has gone haywire, 55 Democrats, legislators, civilians, who decided that the legislative process was so broken that they had to leave for Ardmore and the belief by this body and Members of this body that it was a Federal offense and abuse of power by the use of Federal resources, this resolution simply

asked that the Attorney General be directed within 14 days to be able to present all of the facts so that, again, the truth could be known.

I am disappointed that even after a vigorous debate, even after narrowing the resolutions, even after the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) offered an amendment to suggest that issues dealing with congressional staff, issues dealing with any other staff that could be utilized, a fair amendment, even after encountering a debate with our colleagues on the other side of the aisle that we would be willing to compromise so that the truth would be known why we had leadership of this House calling the FBI to go after individuals who were only expressing their viewpoint in objection to a runaway legislative process in the State of Texas.

That resolution was voted down, but we will not be stopped because it is important that the Committee on the Judiciary and this House not be known as the cover-up House of 2003. This body, dominated by Republicans, refused to pull back on the Articles of Impeachment on the President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, though many of us spoke against it. And their view was, the truth must be known.

Now, when there has been an enormous suggestion and allegations of abuse of power, the use of the FBI, when we have newspaper reports and testimony or statements made by legislators who heard from the FBI, who heard from Homeland Security, we still cannot seem to get, if you will, the truth that should be told.

So frankly, Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that there may be a reconsideration and we are going to offer another resolution of inquiry to be able to ensure the actual truth be told to the people of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan with respect to this issue because his amendment was a very advanced amendment, cooperative and collaborative amendment in the committee; and I would be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Mr. Speaker, the judiciary considered a resolution of inquiry into a matter involving the Texas legislature when many of the members removed themselves in an attempt to prevent a redistricting scheme that would have been obviously very detrimental to African American and Hispanic Americans.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the time allocated to me now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this event is not the basis for which the Committee of Inquiry was created because even though there was so much harm and possible violation of the voter rights of Americans in Texas, that was not what the Committee of Inquiry was gathered to do.

□ 2000

The committee of inquiry introduced by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) was merely to inquire as to whether or not Federal funds, resources, or personnel had been used in trying to locate the missing members of the Texas legislature during June 11 through June 19, and that was all.

It was claimed by the distinguished majority leader of the House, himself from Texas, that this was a Federal matter, and that there was a justification because redistricting was involved that the Congress had every right to inquire. Whether he is correct or not is not central to the question of whether we should determine whether Homeland Security resources, whether Federal U.S. marshals, whether members of the FBI, whether personnel in the Department of Justice in Washington were used in trying to identify the whereabouts of members of the State legislature. That is all we wanted to do.

In an incredible debate, which fortunately has been reported to the American people and is preserved for all posterity, in a totally party vote, every Republican voted that they did not want to inquire, they did not want to know, they did not want to find out if Federal resources were used. They did not have any interest in knowing if there were any Federal statutes that were broken, whether there were any possible violations of the law.

This is the Committee on the Judiciary of the United States whose responsibility it is to protect the Constitution and its amendments and preserve democracy for the people of the United States of America, a rather striking position, but one that is not over because we did not prevail in the great Committee on the Judiciary in the House of Representatives.

This is a matter, as the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) has admonished us, is not going away. We are not packing up our tents and forgetting about this. We have got to show to people that the Department of Justice is accountable, that the FBI is accountable, that the United States marshals are accountable and that indeed the Members of Congress have a responsibility to know if Homeland Security has now been turned into a partisan operation for any purpose that

anybody in charge happens to think it is.

This is very important because with this kind of attitude there is going to be a great difficulty for the American people to have any confidence in Homeland Security whatsoever.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman will remember a COINTELPRO was utilized against Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. It was a different time. This is a simple inquiry as to whether or not we find ourselves with a modern day COINTELPRO of 2003, whether Federal resources were used to track civilians who had not violated any law, and as my understanding, Dr. King and civil rights activists, it was determined that the COINTELPRO was excessive, that he was not a terrorist, he was not a threat. If anything, he was healing this land. He was bringing us together.

So I would say that it is appropriate for the FBI, of which we have oversight, to themselves want to be known to the United States of America as the institution that it is, with high regard for integrity and high regard for its commission.

PROVIDING AID FOR AFRICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GERLACH). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is always a good thing when the President visits a neglected continent, and so I am very glad that President Bush finally got to Africa; but we must recognize and understand the history of the United States policy and the United States involvement with Africa in order to use this moment to develop a positive, forward-moving agenda that is mutually beneficial.

First of all, the United States has significantly in the past contributed to the underdevelopment of Africa and has been benefited from the geopolitical manipulation of Africa and its leaders, and that is a fact. In the past, the United States has endorsed and funded the regimes of dictators. It has secured and disbursed loans that have left Africa Nations to this day struggling with debt; and it has created a cycle of dependence that has left Africa importing resources, aid, and military support from others. That is a fact.

This cycle of dependency, however, can be broken if the United States would work with Africans instead of against them. Peace, however, is a prerequisite for development. There can be no nation-building without peace. Strengthening Africa's peacekeeping capacity is the only solution to limiting outbreaks of civil conflict and preventing them from spreading to other parts of the region.